

DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENT

Due to the length of the specification herein, Applicants will cite to the paragraph number of the published patent application (PG Pub) of the present application, i.e., US 2008/0194447, when discussing the application description, rather than to page and line of the specification as filed.

Claims 1-3 have been canceled. Claim 4 has been amended by replacing the term “using ... for deodorization” with --comprising deodorizing in the presence of a deodorant comprising--, and by pluralizing particles. Claim 5 has been amended by deleting the superfluous term “the steps of”. Claim 6 has been amended to depend on Claim 4 only.

New Claims 7-23 have been added. Claim 7 is supported by Claim 6. Claim 8 is supported in the specification at paragraph [0010]. Claim 9 is supported in the specification at paragraphs [0014]-[0016]. Claim 10 is supported in the specification at paragraph [0017]. Claims 11 and 12 are supported in the specification at paragraph [0019]. Claim 13 is supported in the specification at paragraph [0020]. Claim 14 is supported in the specification at paragraph [0022]. Claims 15 and 16 are supported in the specification at paragraph [0023]. Claim 17 is supported in the specification at paragraph [0024]. Claim 18 is supported in the specification at paragraph [0037]. Claims 19-21 are supported in the specification at paragraph [0055]. Claims 22 and 23 are supported in the specification at paragraph [0056].

No new matter is believed to have been added by the above amendment. Claims 4-23 are now pending in the application.

REMARKS

The rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. The rejection of Claims 1-3 is now moot in view of the cancellation of these claims. Regarding original Claim 4, it is submitted that the term “using an aluminosilicate particle for deodorization” is not indefinite. Nevertheless, the rejection of Claims 4-6 is now also moot in view of the above-discussed amendment. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.


The rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, is respectfully traversed. Indeed, Applicant’s traversal is substantially similar to the above-discussed traversal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Nevertheless, the rejection is now moot in view of the above-discussed amendment. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner’s indication of consideration of various IDSs at paragraph 3 of the Office Action. However, contrary to the statement therein, initialed copies of the respective Forms PTO 1449 have not been attached to the Office Action. The Examiner is respectfully requested to remedy this deficiency in the next Office Action.

All of the presently active claims in this application are now believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Harris A. Pitlick
Registration No. 38,779

Customer Number
22850
Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)